

**Remarks**

This is in response to the Office Action dated July 27, 2007, in which claims 1-12, 24-28 and 30-32 were rejected. The traversal of the prior restriction requirement was acknowledged as being timely, and the restriction requirement was made final.

With the present response, the applicants amend claims 1, 2, 27, and 28. The applicants request that the above claim amendments be entered. The applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-12, 24-28 and 30-32, as amended, i.e. all currently pending claims, are presently in condition for allowance. The applicants accordingly request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims in light of the remarks herein.

**Claim 30 is in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112**

The Office Action includes a rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and a separate rejection of claims 2, 4-11, 27, 28, and 30-32 under §112, second paragraph. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections in light of the present amendments and remarks.

Claim 30 was rejected alternately under paragraphs 1 or 2 of §112 based on an objection to the recitation, in relevant part, that the means for exploiting the ambient fluid flow comprises an aerodynamic surface on any face of the slider, whereas it is contended in the Office action that the disclosure is limited to an aerodynamic feature on the trailing end of the slider surface facing the medium (O.A. p. 3). The applicants respectfully submit that the specification provides ample support for any face of the slider being able to have an aerodynamic surface that may be comprised in the means for exploiting the ambient fluid flow. As an illustrative example, the specification discloses that surfaces 396, 398, 496, 498 on side surfaces of a slider may be adapted to use the ambient fluid flow at the skew angle to cause a torque on the slider. This illustratively shows that the disclosure is not limited to aerodynamic features on the trailing end of the slider surface facing the medium.

It is also asserted in the Office action that it is unclear that the means can be exploiting the fluid to the bottom or side surfaces of the slider (O.A. p. 6). The applicants respectfully

indicate their discussion of such phenomenon in the specification, and further point out that there is no apparent reason why any surface of the slider could not use the ambient fluid flow to cause a torque on the slider.

The applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 30 complies with the requirements of §112, paragraph 2 and request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claims 2, 4-11, 27, 28, and 30-32 are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claims 2, 27, and 28 were rejected under §112, 2nd paragraph on the rationale that “minimize” is a relative term, with the assertion that the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree (O.A. pp. 3-4) or that it lacks metes and bounds (O.A. p. 6). Claims 4-11 and 30-32 were also indicated without further comment.

The applicants have amended claims 2, 27, and 28. The applicants also respectfully point out that the specification provides a careful and thorough discussion of the well-defined differences and metes and bounds defined by the claim language, and in contrast to other art. As an illustrative example, see. p. 14, line 27 – p. 15, line 13 of the specification, which discuss, for example, how “to minimize the skew angle is to reduce substantially or significantly the skew angle...”

The applicants therefore respectfully submit the specification provides ample support for the meaning of the claim language, and request that the rejection of claims 2, 4-11, 27, 28, and 30-32 under §112, 2nd paragraph be reconsidered and withdrawn.

---

**Kohira does not anticipate claims 1, 24, 27, and 30-32 as amended;**

**Kohira does not render obvious claims 2-12, 25, 26, and 28 as amended**

In the Office Action, claims 1, 24, 27 and 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) with reference to U.S. Patent No. 6,628,480 issued to Kohira et al., and claims 2-12, 25, 26, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) also with reference to Kohira.

The applicants have herein amended claims 1 and 27. The claim amendments are well-supported by the specification. The applicants submit that Kohira and the official notice do not

anticipate the subject matter of claims 1 and 27 as amended. For example, other art has taken for granted designs that resist yaw rotation, and have been focused on increasing the stiffness with which such yaw rotation is resisted, while the innovative elements of claims 1 and 27 illustratively include the novel feature of a suspension interface that provides substantial freedom of rotation of the slider about a yaw axis relative to the suspension. Note that while the Office action calls on discussion of pitch angle in Kohira (O.A. p. 7), the pitch angle is linearly independent of the yaw angle, and any disclosure related to specification with regard to the pitch angle has no general relevance to characteristics with reference to the yaw angle. No indication is apparent of a disclosure of providing substantial freedom of rotation of the slider about a yaw axis relative to the suspension in Kohira or in any basis for official notice. The applicants therefore respectfully submit that claims 1 and 27 recite novel subject matter, and request that the rejections of these claims under §102 be reconsidered and withdrawn in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Similarly, the applicants submit that claims 24 and 30-32 are novel over Kohira and official notice and claims 2-12, 25, 26, and 28 are non-obvious over Kohira and official notice, due at least to the novel and non-obvious features they incorporate by dependency from claims 1 and 27 in accordance with the discussion above, in addition to their further novel and non-obvious elements. The applicants therefore request that the rejections of these claims also be reconsidered and withdrawn in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

**Conclusion: Claims 1-12, 24-28, and 30-32 are in condition for allowance**


---

In view of the above comments and remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are all presently in condition for allowance. The applicants therefore hereby request that the rejection of claims 1-12, 24-28 and 30-32 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Bryan F. Erickson, Reg. No. 51,655  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222  
Fax: (612) 334-3312

BFE/elk

---